

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-6325

DONALD CORNELIUS JACKSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MS. WILEY, Nurse, Deep Meadow Correctional Center; DOCTOR MOORE, Assistant Warden, Deep Meadow Correctional Center; D. GRAHAM, Ms., Grievance Coordinator, Deep Meadow Correctional Center; SONJA JOHNS, Doctor, Deep Meadow Correctional Center; PAGE TRUE, Mr., Warden, Sussex I State Prison; K. FOWLKES, Ms., Law Librarian, Grievance and Ombudsman Officer, Sussex I State Prison; MR. SMITH, Sergeant, Sussex I State Prison; T. TYLER, Ms., Medical Administrator, Sussex I State Prison; DR. WILSON, Sussex I State Prison; RUFUS FLEMING, Regional Director; DAVID ROBINSON, Warden, Nottoway Correctional Center; J. TERRY, Ms., Law Library, Nottoway Correctional Center; N. MATTHEWS, Ms., Grievance Coordinator, Nottoway Correctional Center; L. THOMPSON, Doctor, Nottoway Correctional Center; W. P. ROGERS, Mr., Regional Director,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District Judge. (CA-02-652-2)

Submitted: June 30, 2004

Decided: July 22, 2004

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donald Cornelius Jackson, Appellant Pro Se. Keith B. Marcus, BREMNER, JANUS & COOK, Richmond, Virginia; Mark Ralph Davis, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Michael Eugene Ornoff, ORNOFF & ARNOLD, P.C., Virginia Beach, Virginia; Lynne J. Fiscella, Edward Joseph McNelis, III, Ashton Marie Jennette, RAWLS & MCNELIS, P.C., Richmond, Virginia; Jeff Wayne Rosen, PENDER & COWARD, P.C., Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Donald Cornelius Jackson appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Jackson v. Wiley, No. CA-02-652-2 (E.D. Va. filed Feb. 11, 2004, entered Feb. 12, 2004). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED